DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 369 157 EA 025 762

AUTHOR	Hixson, Judson
TITLE	Restructuring Schools: Exploring School-Based Management and Empowerment Issues. A National Perspective.
INSTITUTION	North Central Regional Educational Lab., Oak Brook, IL.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	90
CONTRACT	400-86-0004
NOTE	11p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT	Policy Briefs; n12 1990
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Involvement; *Decision Making; Elementary Secondary Education; Public Schools; *School Based Management; *School Restructuring; Teacher Influence; *Teacher Participation; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	*Teacher Empowerment

ABSTRACT

School-based management and teacher empowerment are consistent elements of school restructuring efforts nationwide. These developments have grown out of frustration over the failure of centralized efforts to significantly improve schools and increase support for individual empowerment. Teacher empowerment is based on four assumptions: (1) classroom decisions are best made by those most knowledgeable about the students affected; (2) classroom decisions should be made by those responsible for implementation and accountability; (3) centralized decisions deprive teachers of the opportunity to make professional judgments; and (4) teachers should have more input in defining their profession. School-based management assumes that school staff, primarily teachers, are the best situated to make decisions that will affect the classroom. School-based management also can improve teachers' feelings of professionalism and connection to restructuring efforts. However, educators and community members newly involved in school-based management may have differing and conflicting ideas and may lack the necessary knowledge base. School restructuring efforts and future plans are included for Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin. Commentaries are included by Robert M. McClure, National Center for Innovation, National Education Association; and Nancy Truelson, North Olmstead City Schools, Ohio. Contact addresses for seven state education departments are included. (Contains 11 references.) (JPT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Policy Briefs

Number 12 • 1990

A Publication of the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory

ED 369 157

Restructuring Schools: Exploring School-Based Management and Empowerment Issues

A National Perspective

by Judson Hixson, NCREL

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Policy Briefs are reports on the status of current issues in education from a national perspective, descriptions of actions and agendas in the NCREL region, commentaries by experts from their particular point of view, and resources for further information.

Throughout the country, strategies for school reform and restructuring have been as wide-ranging and diverse as the settings in which they occur. Two, however, appear consistently as part of school reform plans--teacher empowerment and school-based management. Both have become the hallmarks of attempts to improve the nation's public schools.

These strategies are based on (1) a growing frustration with the apparent inability of centralized "bureaucracies" to significantly improve schools, and (2) a growing body of research from the private and corporate sectors on the benefits of "employee involvement" and decentralized decision-making. This edition of *Policy Briefs* explores some of the dimensions of the teacher empowerment concept, particularly as they have been incorporated into the broader strategy of school-based management.

Teacher Empowerment: Basic Premises

Calls for the empowerment of teachers often derive from four premises or assumptions:

- Instructional and curricular decisions can best be made by those who are most knowledgeable about the students they will affect.
- Decisions about what should happen in classrooms on a daily basis should be made by those who will be responsible for implementation and accountability.
- Centralized decisions about classroom practices deprive teachers of the opportunity to make professional judgments about what strategies will work.
- Increasing the professional roles and responsibilities of teachers requires that they become more directly involved in issues affecting the overall status of the profession, such as certification, selection, preservice and inservice training, and evaluation (Clune and White, 1988).

Overall, proponents of increased teacher empowerment argue that allowing teachers to exercise professional judgment, discretion, and autonomy in making decisions (about curriculum, instruction, and classroom management) will result in : (a) better and more appropriate decisions; (b) increased commitment and enhanced teacher performance; (c) increased willingness of teachers to assume responsibility for instructional results; and (d) most importantly, improved student achievement.

Although strategies for teacher empowerment have often been linked to various forms of school-based management, there are also several types of "empowerment" initiatives that are not tied to broader school-wide initiatives.

Managing the Profession. In several school districts, states, and in one national project, teachers are assuming greater responsibility for who becomes a teacher and how they are trained and brought into the profession. In Minnesota and Vermont, for example, boards composed largely of teachers are responsible for certification guidelines. In Ohio, the teachers' union, the Columbus Board of Education, and The Ohio State University have entered into a three-way partnership to manage the preservice training and induction of new teachers, as well as the continuing professional development of current staff. In Toledo, Ohio, the local teachers' union shares responsibility with the

EA025 762

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

central administration for evaluating beginning teachers and making recommendations for issuance of permanent certificates. At the national level, teachers in the two major teachers' organizations, American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and National Education Association (NEA), have assumed a prominent role in the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. And as primary designers of new curricula in other districts around the country, teachers are also assuming new roles as mentors for beginning teachers and as coaches for colleagues.

Creating new classroom environments. In some districts, schools are experimenting with teacher empowerment through the creation of model/experimental classrooms or "schools within a school" that allow individuals or groups of teachers to develop innovative approaches to instruction, curriculum, and strategies for changing how students are grouped for instruction. At Lassiter Middle School in Louisville, Kentucky, for example, a group of five teachers have joint responsibility for up to 150 primary students. These approaches, however, typically operate as experiments and usually do not affect the overall operation and organization of the school or district.

Teacher Empowerment Through School-Based Management

Proposals for school-based management also reflect assumptions about the benefits of decentralized management and decisionmaking. The basic assumptions are:

- Decisions about how a school operates should be made by those who are expected to be accountable for the results.
- Staff performance and commitment improve in direct proportion to their degree of involvement in decisions about what will be done and how it will be done.
- Opportunities for meaningful involvement of parents and other members of the community in the operation of the school contributes to improved student performance.
- In many districts, centralized decisionmaking has simply not produced acceptable results.

Although school-based management has been proposed primarily as an alternative management paradigm, it rests on the fundamental premise that school staff, primarily teachers, can and will be enabled to assume new roles and responsibilities and will be able to coordinate these new obligations with their primary responsibility for classroom instruction.

Examples of strategies for school-based management are too numerous to detail here. In general, however, they range from the Chicago approach of elected Local School Councils with far-reaching powers including the employment of principals, budget allocation, and curricular decisions; to the teacher-managed school in Hill City, Minnesota, where the role of the principal is assumed by a committee of teachers; to the Detroit, Milwaukee, and Dade County (Florida) models, where school-based teams develop local school improvement plans and have broad discretion to apply for waivers from standard district policy where necessary. In all of these cases, teachers are assuming new roles as primary players in the planning, implementation, and day-to-day management and monitoring for the school as a whole as well as within their individual classrooms.

Benefits

What have we learned from these various experiments? On the benefits side, strategies for empowering teachers appear to:

- Increase feelings of professionalism among staff
- Increase interest, ownership, commitment, and excitement about the school and/or program
- Encourage reexamination of current programs and strategies and development of new innovative approaches
- Encourage making decisions more carefully and appropriately matched to student needs
- Shorten time lines for decisionmaking and program implementation
- Increase faculty interest in their own professional growth and development
- Minimize "surprise" changes in programs, goals, and fiscal allocations
- Improve collaboration among faculty and encourage better utilization of faculty experience and expertise
- Improve the level of community and parent support and involvement in the school
- Enhance accountability for improved student performance

Challenges, Cautions, and Considerations

Although the possible benefits of teacher empowerment through school-based management have been noted, some cautions and other considerations also should be mentioned for those undertaking school restructuring.

Educators, like all other professionals, are not uniform in their expertise or attitudes. Many teachers and administrators do not have the knowledge base necessary to make informed judgments about new instructional or curricular possibilities.

Further, in spite of evidence to the contrary, some teachers and administrators persist in beliefs or

attitudes that some students can only learn minimal skills, that tracking and retention enhance student achievement, and that there are inherent deficiencies in the students themselves or their families due to the communities from which they come. Given these factors, it is appears that for empowerment and school-based management to be successful, greater emphasis on professional development must be incorporated into the process. (McClure speaks to this concern later in this document.)

Similarly, parental and community involvement in decisionmaking must be critically examined. In today's world, some parents simply are not prepared or disposed to assume primary responsibility for making critical judgments about the goals, priorities, and directions of schools. Again, if parents are to provide the touchstones of reality and concern that are expected in school-based management models, we must be prepared to provide them with training, information, and support.

Decentralizing responsibility and decisionmaking, whether within an individual school or across a school district, can result in increased accountability. Alternately, overall accountability for a school's or district's performance as a whole can be scattered and diluted. This is particularly important in large county and urban districts that encompass many schools. Schooling is, after all, a societal responsibility; the concern for, and the impact of, what happens in schools goes beyond the individual student's parents, the local school faculty, or the community. That a Local School Council is satisfied with the performance of the school is an important element of the accountability equation, but it is not the only one. In addition, there is the real danger that schools will be pushed to focus their efforts only on outcomes that can be easily measured by standardized, multiple-choice tests. This narrowing of the school's focus in the name of accountability often results in failure to pay sufficient attention to other equally important academic and affective goals. In such cases, increased test scores may not be the same as true improvement in the quality of education all students receive.

In large districts, school-based management can increase an unhealthy competition among schools for a fixed pool of resources, and further, can exacerbate inequities among individual schools. Also, there is a potential for the school to become a "battleground" for conflicting non-educational agendas of individuals within the school, or organizations and other groups in the community.

Glickman (1990) suggests some additional considerations that should be taken into account in the planning and implementation of any "empowerment" effort. Among Glickman's ironies of empowerment are the following:

- The more an empowered school improves, the more apparent it is that there's more to be improved.
- The more an empowered school is recognized for its success, the more non-empowered schools criticize it.
- The more an empowered school works collectively, the more individual differences and tensions among staff members become obvious.
- The more an empowered school becomes a model of success, the less the school becomes a practical model to be imitated by other schools.

Some Preliminary Conclusions

As schools and districts explore the potential of increased teacher empowerment and autonomy or school-based management as vehicles for school reform, restructuring and improvement, research by Bailey (1990) and Clune and White (1988) among others suggests six basic areas that should receive more attention and consideration than has typically been the case:

(1) Improved delineation and coordination of rules, roles, and responsibilities within the schools, between the school and central office, and between the school/central office and state departments of education

(2) Massive increases and improvement in the quantity and quality of training and support

(3) New systems, strategies, and standards for accountability

(4) Redefining contractual relationships and provisions between teachers and school systems

(5) Increased attention to process as well as outcomes

(6) Changes in the preservice preparation of both teachers and administrators

In addition, school staff must be aware of the various challenges, "ironies," and contradictions they will likely encounter along the path toward empowerment, and make provisions to avoid or account for them from the beginning of the process.

Overall, strategies for empowering teachers and moving decisionmaking authority to the local school level provide important vehicles for improving and ultimately restructuring public schools. Both strategies may well be necessary, but they are not, in and of themselves, sufficient to solve the complex problems faced by the schools, their students, and the communities which they serve. Nevertheless, increasing the opportunities for teachers and local schools to serve a more central role in restructuring efforts appears to be a significant first step in the right direction. ■

Judson Hixson is the Director of Professional Preparation and Development at NCREL.

Regional Action & Agendas

Illinois

Central to the restructuring effort in Illinois are two primary initiatives: Accelerated Schools focuses on elementary schools, and Essential Schools addresses the high school level. Both initiatives subscribe to the principle of site-based management or shared decisionmaking as the administrative system designed to improve education at the school site. In essence, site-based management has empowered Accelerated and Essential School staff to rethink and redefine their roles, responsibilities, and relationships during change. Many of these schools have participated in skill development training to increase their ability to reach consensus, function as a team, and establish new relationships among administrators, parents, and teachers during change. The degree of implementation among these schools varies greatly. Some staff have been given considerable autonomy over curriculum, budget, and employment. Others continue to struggle with control, establishing new relationships, and empowerment of teachers and parents.

Although these individual schools are unique within their district, other examples of district-wide efforts can be seen. The state's largest and most visible example of site-based management/empowerment is in Chicago, where Local School Councils made up of parents, teachers, community members, and the principal have control over management and the budget of the school building. In other districts leaders are taking steps to facilitate and support site-based management. For example, one district has employed a school improvement coordinator to assist schools in this aspect of restructuring. Other districts have created teams that design programs and provide professional development, design and adapt curriculum, and assist with budget and personnel management.

Legislation

Illinois received $1.3 million in general state revenue to provide school improvement change grants to schools. One area in which they may apply for funding is site-based management. The School Code of Illinois, Section 10-19, provides the State Board of Education with the authority to grant waivers to establish experimental high school programs. A legislative proposal to expand this authority to programs serving students in grades K-8 is being introduced.

Future

Evaluation of the Accelerated and Essential Schools programs will yield data on this issue and should provide guidance for future direction. A practitioner's guide based on the experiences of these schools is being developed for use by schools wishing to explore site-based management/shared decisionmaking.

Indiana

Indiana has become a "Re: Learning" networking state. Six to ten pilot schools will receive restructuring grants. Awareness workshops about restructuring in general were held around the state.

Legislation

During the last legislative session, $675,000 was appropriated for the 21st Century Restructuring Pilots.

Future

Expansion of the pilot sites and restructuring initiatives such as CHOICE pilots, thematic school expansion, early childhood/latchkey programs, and extended school year programs are planned for the future.

Iowa

Since 1989, certification/licensure has been governed by a practitioner board. Since 1988, $42 million has been distributed to teachers in districts based on district plans that were collaboratively developed in each district.

Legislation

The Governor's commitment is to bring Iowa teacher salaries to the national average at a $90 million cost. Legislative incentives for "comprehensive school transformation" include $42 million to fund the Excellence Plan for site-based decisionmaking.

Future

In three to four years, $90 million may be available.

Michigan

Restructuring is being promoted statewide as an "evolutionary" step in the comprehensive school improvement planning process. To guide them, many schools are using the State Board of Education definition of restructuring which states that restructuring is the reforming of the interrelationships of an organization and a strategy used to analyze and redesign the organization or structure of a school building in order to achieve desired student outcomes. A grant from the Education Commission of the States (ECS) for $8,000 was received for 1990-91 to promote the "Re: Learning" program.

Legislation

The 1990-91 State Aid Act includes $2 million for pilot school restructuring projects. The second year of funding will support continuation grants and new projects.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Future

Creation of a network for educators involved in school restructuring is planned.

Resources

The state legislature has appropriated $2 million for competitive grants.

Minnesota

Site-based management and empowerment are being addressed through the integration of 17 outcomes that are being field tested through the Department of Education to determine their collective impact on the transformation of schools. They are also being implemented through the 15 research-referenced characteristics of the Minnesota Educational Effectiveness Program.

Legislation

The present statute supports the implementation of site-based management. The outcomes of the Office of Educational Leadership include both site-based management and the creation of environments that will empower staff.

Future

Site-based management and empowerment will continue to be a major emphasis of the Department, delivered through integrated outcomes which lead to the transformation of the education system. Technical assistance focusing on the development of issues and processes that do not support the transformation of education must be discontinued. Teacher training programs and research and development efforts will continue.

Resources

Technical assistance is provided to research and development personnel, including teachers, principals, central office staff, and school board members. The Department provides technical assistance to the sites as they implement the state plan. Each R&D site has been awarded a grant of $100,000 to support implementation and research and development.

Ohio

The state of Ohio provides $1.4 million in subsidy funds to school buildings to develop, implement, and/or maintain a comprehensive school-based Effective Schools Program.

Legislation

In accordance with Am. Sub. House Bill 111: "Annually, $1,450,000 shall be set aside to be used by the Department of Education for providing the State matching funds, for planning, developing, and implementing the federal building-based Effective Schools Program."

Future

Due to the increased interest by school building administrators in developing a school-based Effective Schools Program, the proposed subsidy funding level has been requested to be increased to $4,635,000 for FY92 and $5,098,500 for FY93.

Resources

Pamphlets are available on the Effective Schools Process, the Ohio Building Leadership Model and the Ohio Academy for School Improvement (Principal's Academy). Also available is information on Ohio's Classroom of the Future project which includes pilot projects, in local school districts, aimed at restructuring schools to meet the needs of the 21st Century.

Wisconsin

Several committees of the Governor's Commission on Schools for the 21st Century (a 76-member task force that reports to the Governor and legislature) are recommending that school districts adopt site-based management and other organizational changes with the ultimate goal of improving student learning. The Milwaukee school district has implemented site-based management in many of its individual schools.

The state shares in local school costs through an equalized aid formula. Any costs for site-based management or other changes in school administration would be shared by the state under the school aid formula. While funding for organizational changes will be proposed in the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) budget, no funding is now targeted specifically for that purpose.

Legislation

The Governor may incorporate recommendations from the Governor's Commission (described above) in his 1991-93 biennial budget to be proposed February 7, 1991.

The DPI in its biennial budget request will also advance initiatives to fund the LEAD Academy (a program that provides mid-career training for school administrators on topics such as shared decisionmaking), an Office for School Restructuring, and projects implementing school organizational improvements such as site-based management, decentralization, and teacher empowerment ■

Guest Commentary

by Robert M. McClure, National Education Association (NEA) National Center for Innovation

In 1985, the NEA initiated the Mastery in Learning (MIL) Project to explore how school faculties can be organized and empowered to assume responsibility for planning, initiating, and sustaining fundamental changes in their own schools. The project recently culminated its work with 26 schools across the country. Selected from a pool of 1,400 applicants, the schools were chosen using criteria designed to produce demographic representativeness in such dimensions as race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status of students; types of communities served; and organizational structure. (Five schools were in the NCREL region: Key Elementary in Indianapolis, Indiana; Stuart Elementary, Flint, Michigan; Clinton Elementary, Clinton, Ohio; Paul Norton Elementary, Bettendorf, Iowa; and Willow Creek Junior High, Rochester, Minnesota.)

It is important to note, however, that this was not simply a site-based decisionmaking experiment. The MIL Project attempted to learn what happens to education quality when a school faculty, organized knowledge, and the authority to act are brought together at the school site. The balance of these comments, therefore, focuses on two aspects of teacher empowerment: the effects of enhanced collegiality and the effects of greater participation in the creation of new knowledge about school improvement.

Collegiality

When asked to describe positive aspects of their schools at the beginning of the Project, teachers usually mentioned their close personal relationships with one another--their high regard for their colleagues as individuals. As the MIL Project proceeded, however, it became clear that these relationships were primarily social and, though school-based, not firmly rooted in the business of schools, i.e., learning, teaching, and curriculum development.

As faculties began to engage in spirited dialogue about their visions of what their school could become, or how the curriculum could be reorganized, or how the schedule should be changed, substantive disagreements that had not surfaced during the old ways of working together emerged. Therefore, new definitions of conduct and new patterns of relating to each other had to be worked out. Some of the faculties were unable to develop new ways of working together and even suffered a diminution of their former sociability.

Most faculties in the Project, however, were able to build upon their social cohesion and became professionally engaged with one another in examining critical educational issues. In these schools, the substance of this engagement was more student oriented, more balanced between classroom and school-wide concerns, and considerably more lively--perhaps even passionate!

The progression to collegiality developed through several stages with some consistency across the 26 sites (McClure, 1988). The progression went from early exhilaration and commitment to, in just a few months, disillusionment, then regeneration, experimentation, and comprehensive action. Understanding these phases, knowing they are, apparently, generic to the work of faculty-led school renewal, and understanding the implications for policy and practice decisions is important information for those embarking on such a journey.

Engagement with the Knowledge Base

In *Teachers Using Research: What Does It Mean?* Carol Livingston and Shari Castle (1989) defined the MIL view of an operational knowledge base as one that consists of "the full range of knowledge resources available to the profession. These include theoretical, philosophical, empirical, and practical resources" (p.14). They caution, however, that if the school is to be the center of change, it is inappropriate to conceive of a research utilization model in which the practitioner is only a user, and the researcher is only a producer. Integration of the two needs to occur. As Ken Sirotnik and Richard Clark (1988) contend:

> We must examine the idea of schools as centers of decision making and renewal, or we will find that all our discussion of school-based management will simply propel us further along the path toward unsuccessful efforts at change and renewal. If we don't understand the significance of the school as center of change, we will continue to see it only as the target of change. And we will fail to recognize and tap the reservoir of knowledge and talent that already exists there (p.664). (emphasis added)

To use the knowledge base interactively, the 26 MIL schools are now connected with one another through computer technology--the IBM/NEA School Renewal Network. In addition to the schools, other participants include several of the feder-

ally funded research and development laboratories, several universities, and schools participating in the other site-based renewal projects. The system, designed for interaction around topics germane to school restructuring, was conceptualized primarily by assessing the information needs of the MIL faculties and their dialogue around such topics as critical thinking, instructional strategies, at-risk students, authentic student assessment, and parent involvement. Each of these topics is facilitated by a researcher and a practitioner.

As faculties have become more sophisticated in their utilization and knowledge of research, there has been an expansion of their view of research:

- For contemplation and deliberation--the practitioner as critical adapter
- For transformation--research as a stimulus for paradigm shifts
- For production--active collaboration among faculty and between practitioners and researchers (Livingston and Castle, 1989)

There has been a dynamic interaction between creating new ways of working together and the process of continuing inquiry. As a result, faculties in the network schools are different now than at the outset of the Project. They are increasingly aware of the knowledge base that undergirds their work and are more likely to consider it useful in solving their problems. They see themselves as powerful shapers of the future of their school for they are more collegial and less isolated; more savvy about the politics of school systems; and better able to view their school in a comprehensive manner. They are clear about the values they hold and are, often passionate about them. They feel more influential in affecting student learning.

Based on these findings, I would contend that true, meaningful teacher empowerment needs to be initiated in an environment that permits and encourages:

- Professional colleagueship
- Access to useful knowledge, and opportunity to be a partner in producing new understandings about teaching, learning, and curriculum
- Through contractual and board policy, the authority and responsibility to participate in the critical decisions regarding teaching and learning ■

Robert M. McClure is the Director of the National Education Association Mastery in Learning Consortium, Washington, DC.

Guest Commentary

A School District's View of the Positive Potential of Teacher Empowerment

by Nancy Truelson, North Olmsted City Schools, Ohio

The positive empowerment of all educators, and teachers in particular, ought to rank somewhere at the top of the list with motherhood, apple pie, and the American flag. Kindling the spirit of our nation's teachers by helping to build their pride, morale, self-esteem, and self-confidence, and valuing their ideas and leadership is a mission we all (including teachers) must undertake. Professional empowerment is a dynamic way to kindle this spirit and clearly offers the greatest potential among all options for making American education what it can and must become. Businesses, organizations, and parent/citizen groups can provide much-needed help and support; but empowering teachers to help lead in the creation of inspiring, high achieving, success-oriented schools for themselves and their students must be the vision if significant change is to occur on a school-by-school basis.

American education is not debilitated by lack of teacher, student, or parenting potential. It is negative, debilitating attitudes that keep us from pulling together and becoming all we are capable of being. Negative "we-they" attitudes abound in many districts. External dissatisfaction is bad enough but what is worse are the "we-they" negatives within our own organizations. In many school districts we have become our own worst enemies. For any of us to contribute to negative debilitating attitudes is totally mindless. It is understandable that there are many frustrated, angry, saddened, and demoralized people in education--particularly teachers. What is happening to them and their profession ought to sadden us all. Together "we" can change both the image of teachers and the quality of American education by valuing everyone's

best ideas and positive leadership.

For us in North Olmsted, Ohio, empowerment raised its head as a national topic just after a heart-wrenching teacher strike that followed 13 consecutive tax issue defeats. Needless to say, teacher empowerment wasn't an endearing thought for the school board or administration. It was perceived as having the potential to keep the battles going rather than a beautiful way to develop human potential.

A year after the strike, we were still a demoralized district. Six proactive administrators began a study of organizational leadership. In the business world, Peters and Waterman's *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies* and other business literature relating to tapping employee potential and building organizational pride were prevalent. We liked what we read and built our Motivation to Excel (MTE) action research program around these ideas. The major thrust was staff and student motivation with parents and community included in the program's spirit.

The MTE program was initiated system-wide in 1985. The principal goal was to build teachers' pride, morale, self-esteem, self-confidence, and leadership potential. In reality, that's what teacher empowerment is all about. Merriam-Webster's definition of empowerment is "...to render able, often by giving power, strength or competence...the right to act." These are ideas every educated person values. Empowerment also has excellent synonyms such as enable, endow, and invest. When based upon positive attitudes and a belief in one another, the positive empowerment of teachers (not to mention all of us in education) increases individual and collegial potential dramatically. Our worse problems come from those who are frustrated, problem-oriented people. All of us gripe and complain from time to time, but for some, being disgruntled has become a lifestyle. We are the gatekeepers of our own minds. Choice of attitude is one of the greatest freedoms we have. Positive attitudes translate into positive people who can and do motivate themselves and others to be all they are capable of being. Positive inspiring empowerment is a gift individuals and organizations give themselves.

We have barely gotten off the ground in implementing the philosophy that activates the MTE program, yet in less than five years the North Olmsted schools have made a major turnaround. Noteworthy achievements include two National Schools of Excellence, nine Odyssey of the Mind World Championships (all run and coached by volunteers), and many other district, school, and individual honors.

Research data on the program is tremendously encouraging. *Schuttenberg's Organization Perception Questionnaire* (1976), a business-model survey, was used to establish school benchmark data and progress at the end of years one, three, and five. In 1985, benchmark data indicated there was a "need for change" in all 14 categories measured. by 1988, only two categories (Involvement in Desionmaking and Self-Actualization) needed minamal change on the district composite.

The district was fortunate to be chosen as one of 21 districts involved in NCREL's study of teacher incentives (Dorman and Fulford, 1989). NCREL data indicate, "Several inducements were viewed as motivating forces in this program. Most often cited was increased teacher efficacy, followed closely by awards and recognition, improved conditions in the work place, and enhanced professional status for teachers. ...The most pervasive positive impacts were in the areas of professional growth, job effectiveness, collegial interactions, and relationships with students." Ninety-three percent favor continuing or expanding the program.

This year, as a continuation of the MTE program, a volunteer group of teachers and administrators will cooperatively teach and learn from Stephen Covey's book, the *7 Habits of Highly Effective People*. Covey's book offers an empowering philosophy that can make a difference in everyone's life.

Things that work in the MTE program are the positive leadership of the Board of Education; the district, school and individual goal-setting process augmented through administrative job targets and teacher alternative evaluation plans; school leadership teams; cooperative teaching teams; continuous progress programs for students; teacher minigrants; and a great deal of parent and community support. It is important to note that the MTE program is based almost entirely on non-monetary incentives. The North Olmsted Schools have come a long way, but we still have much to learn about unleashing staff, student, and parent potential. Positive people power works! ■

Nancy Truelson is a former teacher, principal, and assistant superintendent. She is an educational consultant to the North Olmsted, Ohio, City Schools; the Martha Holden Jennings Foundation; and a lecturer at Cleveland State University. The MTE program is one of five National Council of States on Inservice Education (NCSIE) 1990 National Showcase of Excellence winners.

References & Resources

Clune, W.H. & White, P.A. (1988). School-based management: Institutional variation, implementation, and issues for further research. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education, Rutgers University.

Covey, S. (1989) The 7 habits of highly effective people. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Dorman, A. & Fulford, N. (1989). Incentives closeup: Profiles of twenty-one teacher incentive programs(pp.177-78). Elmhurst, Illinois. North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

Foster, K. (1990, May). Small steps on the way to teacher empowerment. Educational Leadership, pp. 38-40.

Glickman, C.D. (1990, September). Pushing school reform to a new edge: The seven ironies of school empowerment. Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 68-75.

Keopke, M. (1990, October). Rebirth. Teacher Magazine, pp. 50-55.

Livingston, C. & Castle, S. (1989) Teachers using research: What does it mean? In C. Livingston & S. Castle (Eds.), Teachers and research in action (pp. 13-28). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

McClure, R. (1988). The evolution of shared leadership. Educational Leadership, 46(3), 60-62.

Peters, T.J., & Waterman, R.H., Jr. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies. New York: Harper & Row.

Schuttenberg, E.M. (1976). The organization perception questionnaire. Cleveland: Cleveland State University.

Sirotnik, K.A., & Clark, R.W. (1988) School-centered decisionmaking and renewal. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 660-664.

State Contacts

Illinois

Program Development and Intervention
Illinois State Board of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777
Sheryl Poggi
(217) 524-6207

Indiana

Indiana Department of Education
Room 229, State House
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2798
Deanna Durrett/Bob Fallon/Dave Wilkinson
(317) 232-6614

Iowa

Iowa Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
Ted Sullwill
(515) 281-3333

Michigan

School Improvement Office
Michigan Departmnet of Education
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, Michigan 48909
Nancy M. Haas
(517) 373-6724

Minnesota

Office of Educational Leadership
Minnesota Department of Education
624 Capitol Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
Richard J. Messenberg
(612) 296-4064

Ohio

Ohio Department of Education
65 South Front Street, Room 416
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0308
Hazel P. Flowers
James P. Jilek
(614) 466-3318

Wisconsin

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
P.O. Box 7841
Madison, Wisconsin 53703-7841
Faye Stark
(608) 266-1966

WE'VE MOVED !

Our new address is:

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
1900 Spring Road
Suite 300
Oak Brook, Illinois 60521

Our phone number is:

(708) 571-4700

FAX: (708) 571-4716

Please make note of the above changes.

THANK YOU.

Opinions expressed in the commentaries do not necessarily reflect the views of the NCREL staff or Board. Facts and ideas presented in NCREL's Policy Briefs are intended to survey a current issue and not to advocate a particular position.

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. Postage PAID
Elmhurst, Illinois
Permit No. 338

A Publication of the North Central
Regional Educational Laboratory
1900 Spring Road, Suite 300
Oak Brook, Illinois 60521

Telephone: (708) 571-4700
FAX: (708) 571-4716
GTE: ncrel.lab

Jeri Nowakowski, *Executive Director*
Nancy Fulford, *Editor*
Marianne Kroeger, *Production Editor*

This Publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), Department of Education under Contract Number 400-86-0004. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department of Education, or any other agency in the U.S. Government.